The
Quarterly Journal
of the
Mythic Society

Vol. XLII] APRIL 1952 [No. 4

A NOTE ON THE JAVANTHINĀTHAPURAM INSCRIPTION OF VARAGUNA

By K. S. Vaidyanathan, B.A.

The first part of volume XXVIII of *Epigraphia Indica for January 1949* contains an article by Sri. M. Venkataramayya on a fragment of an inscription engraved on a slab built into the front wall of the Viṣṇu temple at Javanthināthapuram, in the Lālguḍi taluk of the Tiruchchiṟappaḷḷi district. It is dated Monday, *Aviṭṭam*, *Dhanus* in the 4 + 9th year of the reign of Kō-Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ *alias* Pāṇḍyādhipathi Varaguṇa Mahārāyar and registers a gift, by the king, of gold for two perpetual lamps to be burnt before the God Perumānaḍigaḷ of Tiru-Mayiraṅgam in Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṅgalam. The gift was left in the hands of a certain Vēḷāṉ (chief) of Aṇḍa-nāḍu.

The record has been taken for publication since it is supposed to solve "a few problems pertaining to the chronology of the reign of this Pâṇḍya king" as the details of date in this inscription can be calculated. We may point out at the outset that there is nothing intrinsically important in this record and particularly in the details of the date mentioned in it or its notice in the determination of the chronology of the Pāṇḍya kings. The record gives

nothing new. Sri. Venkataramayya in editing this record expresses his disagreement with the well considered views of Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer, who after a thorough consideration of the dates of the Pallava and Pāṇḍya kings gave a reasoned chronological frame for the early kings. There is no new argument put forward by Sri. Venkataramayya, nor is there anything of a reconsideration of the known facts in his article as we shall see below. His statements are not only inconclusive but are definitely incomplete, advanced to support what he calls 'latest researches.' His article is open to objection regarding the scientific procedure followed by him and his method of calculation and our known knowledge of ancient Indian geography.

The inscription furnishes only another date with some astronomical details. There is nothing particularly noteworthy about that date. Sri. Venkataramayya has assigned, without any valid reason this date to Varaguṇa II.. Before discussing its validity, we must note that the details of the date found in the inscriptions of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ and Varaguṇa with 4+* years are not only capable of verification, but that there are three, if not more, sets of English equivalents proposed by three different scholars. Any preference to one set over the others must be accompanied by cogent and valid reasoning as to the disposal of the two other sets. Until he has it done, he has no grounds to speak of others. The following are the sets of English equivalents given for these astronomical details.

Sri. M. S. Sarma :

1 Tiruveḷḷarai inscription. 4+9th year *Vris'cikam*, Monday *As'vati* (*As'vini*) = A. D. 780, November 13, Monday. (*J. O. R.* Vol. IX. P. 228)

2 Lâlguḍi B. 4 + 9th year, *Dhanus*, Tuesday, *S'aḍaiyam*. (*S'atabhishaj*) = A. D. 780, December 5, Tuesday (*J.O.R.* Vol. IX. P. 227-8)

Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer :

1 Tiruveḷḷarai inscription. Details of date noted above =A.D. 824, November 7, Monday (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XX. P. 51).

2 Lālguḍi B. Details of date noted above = A. D. 824, November 29, Tuesday. (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XX. P. 46 ff.)

Sri. M. Venkataramayya:

1 Tiruveḷḷarai inscription Details of date noted above = A. D. 874, November 22, Monday. (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVIII. P. 39)

2 Lālguḍi B. Details of date noted above = A. D. 875, December 6, Tuesday. (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVIII. P. 39)

3 Javanthināthapuram inscription. 4 + 9th year, *Dhanus*, Monday, *Aviṭṭam* = A. D. 875, December 5, Monday (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XXVIII. P. 39).

Before disproving the arguments of Sri. Venkataramayya, we shall discuss the inaccuracy of the calculations. As will be seen from the above the two dates (of Tiruveḷḷarai and Lālguḍi inscriptions), they are about 23 days apart, according to the calculations of both Sri. M. S. Sarma and Sri. K. V. S. Aiyer, while they are not so when Sri. Venkataramayya handles them and are more than one year apart. Instead of 23 days there is a difference of 379 days between the two dates. Therefore, the date equivalents proposed by Sri. Venkataramayya in order to show that they compel him to prefer his set to any other alternative is not only baseless but compels one to the conclusion that the ascription of the inscriptions with these dates to Varaguṇa II is clearly wrong. Again Sri. Venkataramayya says 'that by accepting these dates we get A.D. 861-2 as the year of accession of this Pāṇḍya king, a date which is *precisely the same* as the one obtained for Varaguṇa from the Aivarmalai (Ayyampāḷayam) inscription which couples his eighth year of reign with S'aka 792.' It will be noticed that A. D. 861-2 which Sri. Venkataramayya gives as the accession date of Varaguṇa, a result arrived at by his calculations, is *precisely not the same*, as he avers, as the one which is obtained by the date of the Aivarmalai inscription. It is clearly one year or more later than his date of A. D. 861-2, for by the Aivarmalai inscription Varaguṇa's eighth year being S'aka 792, his date of accession,

as has been correctly taken by Messrs. V. Venkayya [1], K.V.S. Aiyer [2] and K. A. N. S'āstri [3] is A. D. 862-3. Thus Sri. Venkataramayya's calculations are not only inaccurate, but prove also the incorrectness of the ascription of these records to Varaguṇa II and establish that they belong only to Varaguṇa I.

Regarding the dates of kings of other dynasties proposed by others, he tells us that the latest researches show that Nandivarman III, the victor of Teḷḷāṟu, "ruled *approximately* between *C.* 851 and 873 A. D. and not between *C.* 812 and 844 A. D. as held by Sri. Subrahmanya Aiyer; 'for, it can now be accepted *as more or less correct* that Nandivarman II, the grand-father of Nandivarman III of Teḷḷāṟu fame, ascended the throne *somewhere about A. D. 733*"[4] (P. 39-40). To say the least of this statement, it is inaccurate and very indefinite. Assuming for the time that Nandivarman Pallavamalla's accession took place in A. D. 733 (or even 730) and adding 65+52+22+26 (not 24 as Sri. Venkataramayya has given on P. 41) + 18, which are the latest known regnal years of the five kings of the line, we get A. D. 916 (or 913) as the date of the death of the last king Aparājita, which was brought about by Āditya I, who as everyone knows had already ended his reign in A. D. 907. This again proves that Sri. Venkataramayya's assumed Pallava chronology is as unacceptable as his chronology of the Pāṇḍyas.

If the statement made in the Tiruvālaṅgādu plates, the Kanyakumāri inscription and the Tillasthānam record, that Āditya I defeated and killed Aparājita and annexed Toṇḍai-nāḍu be true, as there is nothing to doubt it, then the accession date of Nandivarman Pallavamalla cannot be placed later than A. D. 724 (the date of Āditya's death A. D. 907 *minus* the sum total of the reigns of Pallavamalla's five successors). As such, any date for

---

1. A. R. 1905. P. 68. Para 23.
2. *Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekhan.* P. 139-140: and *Ep. Ind.* Vol. XX. P. 49 f.
3. K. A. N. S'āstri. *Pāndayan Kingdom.* P. 45.
4. Sri. Venkataramayya does not stick uniformally to his dates. He has already given A. D. 725 as the date of accession of Nandivarman II in *J.O.R.* XII. P. 205. (He gave his 58th year as A. D. 783 and 62nd year as A. D. 787.)

the accession of Nandivarman II Pallavamalla, after A. D. 724 would stand discredited.

Sri. Venkataramayya's Pallava-Pāṇḍya synchronisms would show according to his dates, that his Varaguṇa II (Accn. 861-2) started his career as the overlord of his first Pallava contemporary Nandivarman III (851-73), became the vassal of his second Pallava contemporary Nṛipatuṅga (873-99) and was defeated at the great battle of S'rīpurambiyam by a subordinate ally of his third Pallava contemporary Aparājita (899-917) and was still not dead. It is well-known that Āditya I (870-907) the predecessor of Parāntaka I defeated and killed Aparājita and that Varaguṇa's brother's son Rājasiṁha Pāṇḍya was defeated by the Cōḷa king Parāntaka I prior to A. D. 910. In the light of all the historical and chronological variations of Sri. Venkatramayya we need not pay any heed to his naive suggestion that 'the date *C*. 890 A.D.[5] generally assigned to the final annexation of the Pallava territory from Aparājita by Cōḷa Āditya I has to be reconsidered' (P. 41. *f.n.* 11) and it cannot be accepted. He brings Iḍavai into his article without there being any reference to it in the Javanthināthapuram inscription which he edits and tells us that Iḍaiyāṟṟumaṉgalam refers to the same place. The fact that these two place names occur in the reign of one and the same king Varaguṇa shows that the two places existed as such and that there is no need for any change. Neither Iḍavai nor Iḍaiyāṟu had changed names, the one from the other. Both existed simultaneously during the reign of Varaguṇa and both continued to remain with their names unchanged for ever afterwards, being situated miles away. His derivation is thus irrelevant. Curiously enough the inscription specifically locates one in Iḍaiyāṟṟu-nāḍu in the Tiruchchiṟappaḷḷi district, while the other is mentioned as having been situated in Maṇṇi-nāḍu in the Tanjavur

5. K. A. N. S'âstri: *Coḷas* I. P. 133-136. Sri. K.V.S. Aiyer fixed the date of the conquest of the Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam approximately in A. D. 888 (*Ep. Ind.* Vol. XX. P. 49). On a consideration of three inscriptions at Uttaramallur shedding some light on the problem, I have shown that by these records found in the heart of the Pallava country, the conquest of Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam by Āditya I took place during or before the 17th year of his reign, *i.e*, on or before A. D. 887. (QJMS. Vol. XXXV. Pp. 125-8.)

district, very near Tiruviḍaimarudūr. It is unfortunate that two places existing in two different districts should be equated. Further, he considers that Iḍaiyâṟṟumaṅgalam or Javanthināthapuram and Mayilraṅgam refer to one and the same place. No Tamil knowing person would equate an *agrahāra* village (*maṅgalam*, *chaturvēdimaṅgalam*) with *puram* a mercantaile quarter, as has been done here on account of the wide difference between names ending with *chaturvēdi-maṅgalam*, *puram*, *paṭṭinam*, *pākkam* etc.

THE EXPANSION OF SATAVAHANA KINGDOM FROM EASTERN DECCAN

By Y. V. Ramana Rao, M.A., B.L.

It is the unanimous view of Indologists that the original habitat of the Āndhras was the Godavari-Krishna basin[1] with Srikakulam [2] as their capital and that a clan of Āndhras known as the S'ātavāhanas,[3] though initially an eastern power, expanded gradually embracing the greater part of the Indian peninsula.[4] In a recent monograph [5] a quaint attempt has been made to raise some plausible objections to the accepted theory of the expansion of the Āndhra kingdom from the Krishna-Godavari valleys to western Deccan. As the writer expounds his view with the gusto [6] of an original discovery and as his manner of presentation [7] may possibly mislead students who are not thoroughly familiar with the original sources of this period, it seems to be worthwhile to lay bare certain points for consideration. His main contention is that the early S'ātavāhanas did not rule over eastern Deccan [8] and that the S'ātavâhanas ruled over the Krishna-Godavari basin only for three quarters of a century before their fall.[9] The manner in

---

1. V. A. Smith : *E. H. I.* P. 195 : E. J. Rapson : *C. I. C.* XVI, LXXI ; *Cambridge History of India.* Vol. 1, P. 598—600

2. J. Burgess ; *Buddhist Stupas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta.* P. 4 ; V. A. Smith, *E.H.I.P.* 194. : E. J. Rapson : *C. I. C.* Map at CCVIII ; Lionel D. Barnett : *Antiquities of India.* P. 40.

3. E. J. Rapson : *C.I.C.* P. 15 *fn.* 1: *E.I.* Vol. VIII. P. 60. Nāsik No. 2. In Gautami Balasri's inscription, her son is said to have restored the glory of the S'ātavāhana family (*Kula*). "*S'atvāhanakula Yasa-patithā-Pana karasa*" ; *E.I.* VIII. P. 93. Nāsik, No. 22. When Krishna of the S'āta-vâhana family was king, "*S'ātavāhana Kule Kanhe rājāni.*"

4. V. A. Smith : *E.H.I.* (1914) P. 207 : E. J. Rapson, *P.* LXXI, Supra.

5. K. Gopalachari : *Early History of the Āndhra Country*, 1941.

6. *Ibid.* Page 6. Supra.

7. *Ibid.* Pp. 7-22.

8. *Ibid.* P. 16.

9. *Ibid.* P. 23. *fn.* 122.

which he commences to expound his theory raises a hope that the theories so far accepted will be revolutionised or that he will announce startling discoveries. In the initial stage of his argument readers may anticipate that he will revive and reinforce the theory of the late P. T. Srinivasa Ayyangar or Dr. Sukthankar.

Unlike Dr. Sukthankar, he believes that the S'ātavāhanas were Āndhras [10] and he also admits that "the ancient home of the Āndhras then as now was the lower valleys of the Godavari and Krishna." [11] When it is clear that the term "*Āndhra*" was a tribal name and that the word "*S'ātavāhana*" was a dynastic designation and that the original habitat of the Āndhras was the Krishna-Godavari basin, so long as it is admitted that the S'ātavāhanas are Āndhras, it is hard to realise the relevancy of this odd contention that the early S'ātavāhanas did not rule over the Āndhra country, as if the S'ātavāhanas were fundamentally different from Āndhras, especially when there is no evidence either for or against his theory in regard to nineteen out of twenty-two members of the early S'ātavāhana dynasty. He states that the S'ātavāhanas, though they were doubtless Āndhras, [12] *might or might not* have belonged to any royal family in the Āndhradēṣa, or might have been mere nobles or even fortune-hunters. Soon after the disintegration of the Mauryan Empire, they might have "found themselves in a position to strike a blow in their own interest not in the land of their birth which was far away but in the land of their adoption. [13] S'rīmukha appears to have been helped by a number of faithful Āndhras." The early S'ātavāhanas might have conquered Mahārāṣṭra, Malwa and the Central Provinces. (The present Madhya Pradesh).

Strangely enough he does not deny that the S'ātavāhanas ever ruled over eastern Deccan. He expressly states [14] that "in the reign of Siri-yana the S'ātavāhanas were a western as well as an eastern power." Unfortunately it is not stated clearly when and how

10. Gopalachari, *Early History of the Āndhra Country*. (Referred to hereafter as *E.H.A.* P. 21. *fn*. 115.

11. *Ibid.* P. 21. *Supra.*

12. *Ibid* Pp. 26-27.

13. *Ibid.* P. 23. *fn.* 122.

14. *Ibid.* P. 19.

such rapid expansion took place or could take place and how this event "which is not known to any period of South Indian history," [15] and which was incredible in the case of the early S'ātavāhanas could become credible or possible in the case of the later S'ātavāhanas. He appears to doubt the affinities of the S'ātavāhanas to the royal family in the Krishna-Godavari basin. His position is always non-committal. If the Āndhras in the east coast were different from the S'ātavāhanas in the west coast but belonged to the same tribe, were the two clans related to each other or were they hostile? How could they be suddenly amalgamated just a few decades before their fall? How did the S'ātavāhanas, if they were essentially a western power, acquire the dominions on the east coast? Was such acquisition due to military conquest or mere dynastic succession of one branch to the other or due to the coalescence of the two clans? Which of the two alternatives is more probable or natural? What is the evidence in support of his conjecture? To several questions which arise he admits that there is no evidence forthcoming.[15]

He agrees with all Indologists in admitting [16] that the ancient home of the Āndhras was the Godavari-Krishna valleys and that the S'ātavāhanas were Āndhras. He severely criticises Dr. Sukthankar for his temerity in denying the Āndhra affinities of the S'ātavāhanas. He avers that point has been proved beyond doubt. According to his scheme of chronology [17] the S'ātavāhanas ruled from 234 B.C. to 207 A.D. On account of the inscription at Amaravathi [18] he is constrained to concede that only from Puloma II (*Circa* 131-159 A.D.), the later S'ātavāhanas ruled over western and eastern Deccan also. If eastern Deccan comprising the Krishna-Godavari valley was not under the sway of the early S'ātavāhanas for more than three and a half centuries, *i.e.* from 234 B.C. to 131 A.D. who were **then** the sovereigns of the Krishna-Godavari basin? When and how did the S'ātavāhanas conquer

15. *E.H.A. Op. Cit.* P. 27. *supra.*
16. *Ibid.* P. 21.
17. *Ibid.* P. 29.
18. Burgess: *Archæological Survey of Southern India.* I. P. 100 Pl. L. VI. I).

that area ? If that original habitat of the Āndhras was under the hegemony of another clan of Āndhras, was that clan hostile or friendly or even related to the western clan of Āndhras, *i.e.* the S'ātavāhanas ? When and how did the western clan of Āndhras conquer the Āndhradēṣa ? If the early S'ātavāhanas had no manner of connection whatsoever with the Āndhradēṣa, how did the later S'ātavâhanas all on a sudden, just a few decades before their fall, acquire and rule both the eastern and western Deccan ? Where is the evidence in support of such sudden acquisition ?

S'ATAVAHANAS ARE ĀNDHRAS

The sole basis of this specious plea is the entirely misleading suggestion that the dynasty of S'ātavāhana kings who, according to the purāṇas, ruled over Maghadha in succession to the Sungas and Kanvas was different from the dynasty of rulers over the Krishna-Godavari basin. No doubt he does not make a statement to that effect. Indeed the view that the S'ātavāhanas were not Āndhras has been propounded and reiterated by Dr. Sukthankar [19] who contends that the S'ātavāhanas are not called Āndhras in any inscription. The Greek writers mention only Āndhras and do not make any reference to S'ātavāhanas. The purāṇic evidence is absolutely of no value because it is conflicting. From the terms "*Sātavāhana-hara,*" "*S'ātavāhanī rāṣṭra*" Dr. Sukthankar concludes that the home-land of the S'ātavāhanas was the Bellary district mainly on the strength of the Myakadoni and the Hirahadagalli plates and that the land was called after the people (the province of S'ātavāhanas). Dr. Sukthankar completely discredits the purāṇas and exclusively relies on epigraphs. But he relies on a broken reed, for the epigraphs do not support his theory. If western Deccan was the starting point of the S'ātavāhana power, all the inscriptions of the early members of S'ātavāhana dynasty should have been found in that region but they are found elsewhere. In fact an inscription of the S'ātavāhanas is found at Myakadoni.

LITERARY AND EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

Though Sri. Gopalachari is forced to own that the position of Dr. Sukthankar is utterly untenable, he in fact seeks to rehabilitate

19. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute,* 1918-1919. Pp. 21—42.

his view, for Sri. Gopalachari's view is only Dr. Sukthankar's view in new clothes. Sri. Gopalachari had to desert Dr. Sukthankar because the purāṇas were contemporary documents. Five manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa refer to Yagña S'rī as the sovereign who had been reigning in the ninth year [20] (*Nava Varsani Yagni Srih Kuruto S'ātakakarnikaḥ*). The purāṇas also testify that S'rīmuka belongs to the tribe of Āndhras. (*Sindhukohy Āndhra-Jātiyaḥ* or *Sisuko'ndhra sa-jātiyaḥ*).[21] Unassailable inscriptional evidence establishes the fact that the term "*S'ātavāhana*" indicates a clan or family (*S'ātavāhana Kula*). Balasri's inscription speaks of her son as the restorer of the glory of the S'ātavāhana family (*Sātavāhana Kula Yasa-patithapanakarasa*).[22] A Brāhmi inscription on the wall of Cave No. 2 at Nāsik refers to the family of S'ātavāhanas, "*Sātavāhana Kulerājāni*" [23] In the face of this definite, consistent and clear-cut theory, Sri. Gopalachari propounds an unacceptable one.

Sri. Gopalachari seeks to show that the present theory is not supported by all available materials, epigraphic, numismatic and literary. He concedes that "a great part of the S'ātavāhana dominions remains unexplored."[24] But in dealing with inscriptional evidence [25] his statement that out of twenty-four epigraphs as many as eighteen came from western Deccan, leads to a probable inference that the entire area of the S'ātavāhana dominions including the Āndradēṣa had been completely and thoroughly explored by antiquarians and that not even a single epigraph had been found in the entire area in support of the eastern origin of S'ātavāhana power. But the ancient historical sites in the present Telugu-speaking area still await exploration. The archæological department of the Hyderabad State has just commenced the excavation of a few spots near Paithan and other places. The results of such exploration so far published in the

20. F. E. Pargiter: *D. K. A.* P. 42. Note 8.
21. *Ibid.* P. 38.
22. *E. I.* Vol, VIII. Nāsik No. 2. P. 60.
23. *Ibid.* Nāsik. 22. P. 93,
24. *E. H. A. Op. Cit* P. 4.
25. *Ibid.* P. 7.

daily press tend to support the acknowledged theory. It is also necessary to stress the fact that S'rīkakulam, the capital of the ancient home of the Āndhras, had been washed away by the river Krishna[26] and that epigraphic and other historical relics must have found their permanent resting place either in the bed of the river or at the bottom of the sea. It is essential to bear in mind the contention of Sri. Gopalachari that the early S'ātavāhanas (*i.e.* Nos. 1 to 22 in the list of Āndhra kings in the Matsya Purâṇa) did not rule over the eastern Deccan. He himself admits [27] that the inscriptions of kings numbers 4 to 22 in the purāṇic list, are not found either in the western Deccan or in the Āndhradēṣa. In other words, out of twenty-two kings comprising the early S'ātavāhana dynasty, epigraphs are found in regard to only three kings, *i.e.* one-seventh of the total number of the early S'ātavāhana rulers. In respect of the other kings of the early dynasty he can suggest only a negative inference. On the basis of such meagre and negative evidence, no conclusion or inference should be drawn. In view of the above factors, scholars like Dr. Bhandarkar, Rapson and V. A. Smith relied on the long, uniform and unbroken tradition preserved in literature and did not hesitate to postulate an eastern origin of the S'ātavāhana power.

Indeed, there is a strong and unbroken tradition in the Telugu-speaking area, supported by literary evidence that the founder of the Āndhra race settled down in the area round S'rīkakulam and that he fought hard and vanquished the aboriginal tribes and settled down in the area round S'rīkakulam.[28]

The memory of the wars of the original founder of the Āndhra settlement with the native inhabitants is enshrined in the legend of the fight of the Āndhra Viṣṇu with the demon Nes'umba. That memory was still green even in the time of the famous emperor of Vijayanagara, Kṛṣṇadevarāya, who refers to the lord of the Āndhrās in his classical work *Amukthā Mālyatha* and

26. V. A. Smith *E. H. I.* (1914) P. 206.
27. *E. H. A. Op. cit.* P. 7.
28. K. R. Subramanyam. *Buddhist Remains in Āndhra.* Pp. 5-6 and footnotes.

mentions that he worshipped the deity on his way home from his military campaign after the conquest of Kaḷiṅga. The Telugu poet Paravasthu in his poetical work called "*Uttaraka Pancha Bhyuthayam*" describes that S'rīkakulam was the home of the Āndhras and that he offered prayers to the deity, Hari, enshrined in that place. Vinukonda Vallabaraya describes the popular scenes in connection with the annual festivals of this deity. There is literary evidence that the worship of the deity was conducted and that the temple was in sound condition in the sixteenth century but in the beginning of the eighteenth century the worship in the temple ceased and the temple fell into ruins. Sri. Gopalachari is not prepared to accept the tradition embodied in *Trilingānuśāsanam* on the ground that the work is as late as the twelfth century A.D. It may, however, be mentioned that the same tradititiom is also referred to in the Brahmānda Purāṇa which recites "*Āndhra Viṣṇu Surayutho Danujena Nisambhunā*". Pargiter shows that the Brahmānda Purāṇa was derived from the Bhavis'ya Purāṇa which was originally in Prākṛt and that the Brahmânda Purāṇa along with the Matsya Purāṇa was Sanskritised by about 335 A. D. Although the Sanskritisation took place in the first half of the fourth century the subject-matter of the original purāṇa must necessarily have been older. One of the manuscripts of the Matsya Purāṇa proves that it was revised in the ninth or tenth year of the reign of Yagña S'rī (185-186 A. D.). It is clear that the material from which the original purāṇa was composed was contemporaneous with the Āndhra dynasty. At any rate it dates from the second century of the Christain era.[29] Now it is evident that at least from the second century A.D. down to the present day there is an unbroken tradition in the environs of S'rîkakulam in the Kistna district that the first Āndhra settlement was founded by Suchendra, the son of Andhra Viṣṇu.

Sri. Gopalachari makes an astonishing statement that Telugu was in the course of formation in the fifth century A.D. on the ground that some epigraphs of the Viṣṇukundins (350-610 A.D.) contain Telugu suffixes. If he refers thereby to Telugu

29. F. E. Pargiter: *D.K.A.* Introduction, P. 12.

literature, no serious objection can be taken but if he means that even in the fifth century A.D. the Telugu language did not assume an independent individuality from the philological point of view or did not constitute a distinct linguistic entity or was not substantially in the present form, his statement is not only exceedingly misleading but positively inaccurate. He knows very well that in the early centuries before and long after the Christian era Prākṛt in some form or other was the language used in inscriptions and official records. The fact that when Prākṛt or Sanskrit was the official language of the state, the epigraphist was forced by the prevailing custom to interlard inscriptions with words ending in Telugu suffixes, proves that the vernacular (*Dēs'īya bhāṣā*) attainted such literary currency and prominence that the Sanskrit epigraphist could not ignore it. In the *Gāthāsaptasati*, a literary work written in Prākṛt and attributed to Hala (47 A.D.-52 A.D.) in numerous Telugu words are found.[30] There is indisputable evidence that Telugu was a language of commerce in Conjeevaram, Mayavaram and other places in the realm of the Coḷas in 300 A.D.[31] This fact is attested by the Pāli scholiast Buddhaghosa who resided in those places for pursuing his studies.[32] Modern scholars[33] are of the opinion that Telugu is derived from Pais'āci-Prākṛt and that it must have been spoken substantially in the present form even in the early centuries before the Christian era. Inscriptions of the seventh century prove that Telugu had already developed advanced grammar and prosody. A period of thousand years is the minimum period that can be postulated for the development of advanced grammar and prosody for any language.

The script of the Bhattiprolu, Jaggayyapeta and South Indian As'ōkan inscriptions is distinctive and has been designated by Bühler as Dravidian and is almost coeval with the art of writing

30. *Bharathi*, May, 1947.
31. Buddaghosa : *Papancha sudamani*. Pp. 45-51.
32. A. P. Buddhadatta ; *University of Ceylon Review*, Vol. III. Pp. 34-40.
33. Dr. C. Narayana Rao : *History of Telugu Language*, (University of Andhra). Pp. 65. 76, 559, 576.

(700 B.C.). In these early inscriptions the names of places in archaic Telugu are discernible. In an ancient literary work written by Gunadhya in Pais'āci-Prākṛt called "*Brihad katha*" there is further testimony that at the period of its composition in the dominions of the Sātavāhnas three languages were in current use, namely, Sanskrit, Prākṛt and *Dēs'īya Bhāṣā* (the provincial dialect). The statement of Guṇādhya does not indicate the kind of Prākṛt nor does it specify the provincial dialect (*dēs'īya bhāṣā*),[34] but there can be no doubt whatsoever that there was a dialect spoken by the commonalty designated as "*Dēs'īya Bhāṣā*", when it is borne in mind that both Telugu and Kannada had initially a combined and parallel linguistic devlopment, a passage in a Greek play of the first or second century A.D. entitled the *Oxyrhynchus Papyrus* in early Kannada language is significant.[35] Inscriptions in highly developed Telugu prose and verse in *ragada, manjari, tharuvoja, madhya-akkara, geetham, duipada* and *seesam* metres date from the seventh century A.D. onwards.[36] It is well-known that Prākṛt and Sanskrit had occupied a dominant position for a long time before and after the Christian era. Unless a provincial dialect reached a high state of development it is hardly possible for it to dislodge the Prâkṛt dialects from the predominant position which they had occupied. Early Pallava sovereigns assumed Telugu surnames. Viṣṇukundins bore Telugu honorific titles (*Birudas*). The Addanki grant of Gunaga Vijayâditya (848-892 A.D.) furnishes a clear example of an inscriprion entirely composed of literary Telugu in advanced metre[37]

The extant Telugu literary works (1000 A.D.) are not so old as those of Kannada (500 A.D.) writings. On account of frequent and violent, social, religious and political revolutions, the early Telugu literature promoted by the influence of the Jains and Buddhists, irretrievably perished. There is indisputable evidence that emigrant scholars from Vengi promoted the early Kanarese literature. Nannayya, the poet-laureate of the famous Cāḷukyan

34. *Kathāsaritsagara.* 1, 3649 : 51.
35. *QJMS.* 1928. Vol. XVIII. Pp. 294-341.
36. T. Rajagopala Rao, *Comparative Prosody of Dravidian language*:
37. V. Prabakara Sastri, *Pre-Nannayya, Telugu Prosody.*

monarch, Rājarāja (1025-1060) is the reputed author of the first extant advanced Telugu grammar. Like Dr. Samuel Johnson who is said to have standardised English orthography in his dictionary Nannayya is credited with the title of the standardiser of Telugu language (*Vaganusasana*). He did for Telugu what Pāṇini has done for Prākṛta. His literary writings form the touch-stone of modern literary usage. It was only a few decades ago that a literary revolt was raised against the standardisation initiated by Nannayya. *i.e.* after the lapse of nine centuries; for grammar follows language. If Telugu was the language of commerce in the third century A.D. it must have originated at least a millennium before. The first Telugu grammarian, Kanva, is assigned to the second century B.C. Grammar is only an attempt at reformation and standardisation of usage of any language. It is impossible for a grammarian to flourish unless the language is highly developed and requires regulation. Therefore, if Telugu was not yet formed even in the fifth century A.D. how could any body compose a grammar for it in the second century B.C.? Obviously Sri. Gopalachari is obsessed by the view of Bishop Caldwell who propounded an elaborate theory in the middle of the last century in his work called. "A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages." His theory[38] that Tamil was the parent of South Indian languages was not accepted even then by the contemporary philologists like Pope.[39] Caldwell knew Tamil well, but his acquaintance with other South Indian languages was very slight. He was ignorant of Sanskrit and Prâkṛt dialects. It must be also stated that during the time of Caldwell studies in Prākṛt dialects by Indologists was in a nascent stage.[40] It has been proved by Sri. Swaminathan that the Dravidian words whose origin Caldwell ascribed to Tamil, were derived from Prākṛt and that Tamil was

38. Caldwell, *A Comparative Grammar of Dravidian Languages.*

39. C. Narayana Rao; *A History of Telugu Language* (University of Andhra), Pp. 65, 75, 559, 576,

40. Swaminathan; Readership Lectures at the Calcutta University. August 1924: Proceedings and Transaction of the third Oriental Conference "*The Aryan affinities of Dravidian Pronouns*. Pp. 153-202; Poona Oriental Conference 1919. Vol. I. *Tense in Dravidian Languages.*

deeply influenced by Sanskrit. The theory of Caldwell has been completely superseded by that of Sir G. Grierson[41] that Telugu was independent of Tamil and that both Tamil and Telugu were derived from a common source, a Pais'āci form of Prākṛt. Modern philologists believe that Mahārāṣṭra, Kannada and Telugu had common and parallel development from Prākṛt dialects, that Mahārāṣṭra was the first dialect which branched off from the trunk and that it was later followed by Kannada and that Pais'āci-Prākṛt was dominant in early archaic Telugu.

(To be concluded)

---

41. Sir G. Grierson: *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. V. P. 285.

CHANNABASAVA NĀYAKA

DURING the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries of the Christian Era the Vijayanagara Kings bestowed on or confirmed to vassal chiefs, bearing various titles, sundry tracts in what is now Mysore, on the condition of payment of tribute and rendering of military service. Of these, the important tracts or pāliyapats in Mysore at the time may be mentioned as under: The Nāyaks of Bednur, Basavāpatna and Chitaldroog in the north; the Balam Nāyakas in the west; in the centre the Nāyaks of Hâgalvadi and the Gaudas of Yelahanka and Ballāpur; Suggattur Gauda on the east and on the South the Wodeyars of Mysore, Kalale, Ummatur, Yelandur and others. Hatti. Dodderi, Pāvagada, S'īra, Magadi, Gummanāyakanapālya, Yerukalve, Chikkanāyakanahalli, Māsti, Narsipura and Periāpatna were the other pāliyapats. Those in the northern parts were controlled directly from the capital while the southern parts were placed under the viceroy with S'rīranga-paṭṭana as his seat of government.

After the dissolution of the Vijayanagara Empire following the battle of Rakkasatadagi in 1565 A. D. although a nominal allegiance continued to the representative of the state of Vijayanagara at Penukonda and to the viceroy at S'rīranga-paṭṭana, such of the chiefs who could afford it broke loose of control and declared their independence. In about 1625, Mysore had become powerful with Jagadēvarāya's territory to the north of it and Kempegowda at Bangalore.

Of the several chiefs who asserted their freedom from the yoke of the Vijayanagara sovereignty, the Nāyaka of Bednur in the North-west of Mysore was one. The kingdom of Bednur was founded by two brothers under a *sannad* granted about 1560 A.D. by the Vijayanagara kings of the time and was originally known as the territory of the Nāyaka of Keḷadi. One of its rulers, the famous S'ivappa Nāyaka transferred the capital from Keladi to Bednur situated near the Western Ghauts, as it was not easily accessible to hositle forces. Bednur was called Veṇupura on

account of the extensive bamboos which had grown there. S'ivappa Nāyaka was the most distinguished of the line and his expeditions in Mysore extended to Balam, to Vastāra, to Sakrepatna and to Hassan.

A formidable invasion of the Adil Shahi kings of Bijapur, under Raṇadulla Khan, with whom S'āji, father of S'ivāji was sent second-in-command took place in about 1637 A.D. He overran the whole of the woods of Bednur and its chief was besieged in Kavaledurga but he managed to buy off the enemy. Later in 1684 when the Mughal army under Aurangazeb reduced the Dekhan and created in 1687 a new province with S'īra as capital, Bednur became a tributary state of the Mughal emperor.

S'ivappa Nāyaka, *de facto* ruler of Bednur, had succoured S'rī Ranga Rāya III, a rightful scion of the Meshapala line, ruler of Vijayanagara and given him refuge during the reign of Doddadēvarāja Wodeyar of Mysore somewhere about 1646. He had subdued the ruler of Belur, a professed enemy of Vijayanagara.

Subsequently, Vastāra in the Bābābudans which had been taken by the Mysore armies under Chikkadēvarāya by about 1694 was restored to the Nāyaka of Bednur.

Basappa Nāyaka was ruler of Bednur between 1739-1755 and on his death in 1755 an adopted son succeeded him, but on remonstration with his adoptive mother on her amours, which had become a public scandal, he was put off the way by a *jetti* (wrestler) dislocating his neck in the bath and Vīrājammanni occupied the throne in her own name adopting Somas'ēkhara as son and successor. But her notorious character and imposition of fifty per cent additional tax in order to buy off the Marāṭhas threatened the country and the people.

Channabasva Nāyaka claimed to be the adopted son of Basappa Nāyaka, Rāja of Bednore, who died in 1755. Owing to Vīrājammanni's attempt on his life he had left the palace and was seeking outside help to regain his patrimony. Many did not believe this story. Vīrājammani herself had become odious both

to her subjects and to several of her leading officers on account of a second marriage which she had contracted with one Nambiah. At this time, this pretender to the throne of Bednur, announcing himself as Channabasava Nāyaka who it was supposed had been murdered, had sought protection and assistance from Chitaldroog. He was introduced to Haidar by the Chitaldroog palegar. The invasion of Bednur on behalf of the pretender was then planned. Haidar had also been appraised through his spies of the political weakness of the Bednur kingdom under the rule of this unpopular woman and he pretended to befriend the claim of Channabasava Nāyaka.

Haidar, who had successfully usurped power and entered upon the government of the country by 1761, still simulated a mock submission to the Râja of Mysore. By negotiation with Basalat Jung of Haidarabad and in return for a gift of three lakhs of rupees, Haidar became the Nawab of S'īra, styled himself also as Haidar Ali Khan Bahadur. He captured Hosakote, took Dodballapur and then S'īra. Next he defeated Morari Rao of Gutti who had advanced to the relief of Chikballāpur and occupied it. Kodikonda, Penugonda and Madakas'ira, also his possessions, fell into the hands of Haidar. There were continued hostilities between Chitaldroog, Harpanahaḷḷi, Sâvanur, Bednur and the Marāṭhas and Haidar to whom the pālayagars of Râyadurga and Harpanahaḷḷi had submitted. Placed between the Marāṭhas and Haidar, Madakere Nâyaka of Chitaldroog had no option but to submit.

At the beginning of 1763, Haidar set out on his expedition. While crossing the borders of the Bednur territory Haidar issued a proclamation in the name of Channabasava Nāyaka inviting the inhabitants to their allegiance. Haidar's and the Chitaldroog pālegar's armies invaded the Bednur country. Haidar entered the province of Bednur at the end of January 1763 and on the way at Kumsi found the late Râja's prime minister Lingappa who had long been imprisoned at this place. From him every information was obtained as to the approaches and resources of the capital in consequence of which, Haidar rejecting all the offers of money made to buy him off, pressed on. When Haidar demanded

surrender, the Râṇi Vīrājammanni proudly rejected the proposal and resolved to defend her capital as best she could and Haidar thinking the fortress impregnable went to Anantapur. She sent confidential ambassadors and she conducted herself with as much steadiness and astuteness as if she were a man and the siege lasted nearly a year. The Râṇi and her paramour fled, followed by the inhabitants *en masse*, who took shelter in the woods. Haidar, the instant of his arrival at the border in March, ordered a noisy but feigned attack to be made on the posts in his front, while he himself, at the head of a select column, entered the city by a private path pointed out by the minister. The flames of the palace were extinguished and a seal placed on the doors of all but the poorest of the deserted dwellings. A booty was thus secured which had been valued at twelve millions sterling. Detachments were despatched to the coast in pursuit of the Râṇi. The Râṇi, with her adopted son Somas'ēkhara fled to Ballâḷarâyanadurga, a strong fortress at the head of the Kutakal pass in the Kadur district. Surrounded by Haidar's troops, she was taken prisoner at Ballâḷarâyanadurga and with her paramour, her adopted son, the nominal râja and even the pretender whose cause Haidar had ostensibly espoused were all sent to a common prison at Madgiri, where they were liberated when the Marâṭhas took Madgiri. Vīrâjammanni died on the way to Poona and Somas'ēkhara ended his days unmarried. The conquest of Bednur in 1763 was the foundation of all Haidar's subsequent greatness. The former officials were largely retained in their offices. Oojani also known as Râja Ramchunder an able and intelligent trusted noble was put in charge of the place. According to another account she withdrew with only a few attendants to the hill fort of Kavaledurga for refuge even where she resisted for a month. She spent the rest of her days with Nambiah and Chennabasva Nâyaka at Madgiri.

Kavaledurga, a hill also called in later times as Bhuvanagiri, was a stronghold of the Bednur chiefs. A large stone slab in the place, eight feet square, called the Râṇi's cot and well carved inscriptions in it bearing the year *bhava* corresponding to 1694 are

interesting. At the highest point of the durga or fortress is a temple of S'rīkantēs'vara, a peculiar feature of which is that the only door to it is on the west. There is a fine view from here of the western ocean.

Keladi, Ikkeri or Bednur state was the most considerable of those that were absorbed into the present Mysore territory by the victories of Haidar Ali and its conquest was always acknowledged by him to have established his fortune. Bednur was called the granary of all southern India by Jacobus Canter Vissacher.

Haidar designed to make Bednur his capital and named it Haidarnagar, his family was removed there and the building of a splendid palace, which was never finished, commenced. A mint which struck coins known as Haidari and Bahaduri pagodas was established and a dockyard and naval arsenal were further formed on the western coast for the construction of ships of war.

Masti Venkatesa Iyengar has made use of the historical material and woven a fine novel in Kannåda* bringing into prominence the leading characters of the story, Ḥaidar, Vīrājammâņni, Lingappa, Râja Ramchundar and Channabasāva Nâyaka. Râṇi Vīrājammanni or Vīrammāji is the heroine of the story. The Bâbâbudans and the historical Dattâtreya Pīṭha on the mountain range as well as the Heggadati of Vastāra furnish further material for several descriptive sketches and an interesting byplot into the main theme. Haidar was a courageous and thougtful campaigner, a wise commander and a stimulating politician, looking always forward. The weakness of the ruling rājas, the incapacity of the pradhans and dalvoys afforded vast opportunities to Haidar to exploit the situation. The political struggles of the period, the rivalries between the French and the English, the invasions of the Marāṭhas and the nominal claim of the Mughal emperor added fuel to the fire of Haidar's ambition. Venkatesa Iyengar with

*Channabasava Nayaka (ಚನ್ನಬಸವನಾಯಕ) In Kannada. By Masti Venkatesa Iyengar. Jeevana Publications, Gavipura, Basavangudi P.O. Bangalore-4.

commendable skill interposes into his narrative his love of the country, his patriotism, his ideas of administration and a sense of justice in politics with all the great moral requirements which ought to be provided in the governance of any state. The beautiful characters of S'āntavva and her uncle Nambaiya would do credit to any author in any country. The homely language in which the story is evolved would make the reader feel sometimes that an English rendering of it could be placed before a wider reading public. One other character we might mention and that is the praiseworthy, dutiful maiden Kençhavva. The patriotism of the Heggadati of Vastâra and her affection for the Bednur house knows no limitations. Her servants Saguna and Mallige would like to marry but not without the approval of their Heggadati. There is a shade of darkness and tragedy pervading the story, the end is unhappy. The hero at the time of the realisation and fulfilment of the plans succumbs and his wife S'ântavva is dead. A true sacrifice in the wake of a remarkable *sati* is there, as if in response to a demand for a sacrifice from the heavens above.

S. SRIKANTAYA.

REVIEWS

The Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore. By Benoy Gopal Ray. Published by Hind Kitabs, Ltd. Bombay, Price Rs. 3-12-0. Library Edition Rs. 6-8-0.

TAGORE, the mystic, was seeker after truth; great in stature, greater as a man and greatest of all in his contributions to the sum of human knowledge and the opportunities he created for humanity to reach its destined goal. Gurudev has rendered a service to the world which cannot be measured in terms of time, money or space. Rabindranath Tagore provided the necessary atmosphere to the Indian mind to reach its goal. There is hardly a student in India who is not familiar with one or the other of the poet's master-pieces and who has not heard the glorious music of Rabindranath Tagore. In him and in his works poetry and philosophy have been welded and shown as one. In seven chapters Rabindranath's works have been analysed. In the first the sources that have influenced his philosophy, Vedānta and Vaiṣṇavism, are culled out. The second chapter delineates the relation between the finite and the infinite, the kernel of his philosophy. The third chapter is devoted to the problem of evil and suffering that beset finitehood. In chapter four a discussion of the poet's views on death and immortality are given, while his religious views, how he begins with Brahmoism, passes through liberal Hinduism and finally settles on the universal religion which centres round man are dealt with in chapter five. In the sixth chapter is discussed his idea about the path to salvation. Love and love alone leads one to the infinite. A comparative estimate of the poet-philosopher is given in the last chapter. The book makes a very interesting reading. In all his writings Rabindranath has no where expressed his indebtedness to Greek or European philosophy while on the other hand he has mentioned how deeply the Upaniṣads, Buddhism and Vaiṣṇava lore have affected the formation of his mind. Philosophy is based on the foundation of life to which it belongs, for which it

exists and the eternal throbbing and pulsating life-force permeates the entire field of philosophy. We have no use for academic philosophers and there is no need for a fresh philosophical system. Both Mahatma Gandhi and Tagore thought of the ultimate reality as truth and love. To the Mahatma God was truth and love, the source of light and life and yet he was above and beyond all these. Service to humanity was the greatest merit for both the seers. Both believed in god and in His Oneness. Gandhiji says, salvation is by renunciation but Rabindranath never favours renunciation as he says in *Gītānjali :*

" Deliverance is not for me in renunciation.

" I feel the embrace of freedom in a Thousand ponds of delight.

"......No, I will never shut the door of my senses.

" The delights of sight and hearing and touch will bear they delight."

S. S.

An Introduction to the Philosophy of Panchadasi. By Swāmi Abhedānanda Published by the Ramakrishna Vedanta Math, Calcutta. Price Re. 1-0-0.

THE philosophy of Pancadasi is a unique contribution in the domain of Indian thought and Svāmi Abhedānanda attempts to throw light upon the Vidyāranya or Vivarana school of Vedānta by an introduction which seeks to serve as a guide book to the seekers after truth and Vedāntic knowledge. Dr. Surendranatha Das Gupta in his History of Indian Philosophy, Volume Two, page 215 says that Vidyāranya referred to is the same as Mādhava. As I have mentioned in the Founders of Vijayanagara (Pages 104-106) there does not appear to be much dispute regarding the identity of Mādhava brother of Sāyana with Vidyāranya. When by constant meditation *my* and *mine* disappears the indivisible non-dualistic *ātman* will be perceived in its fulness. Whosoever will realize it, will remain eternally free even in this very life. He will be one

with *Brahman* coming no more under the bondage of *māyā* or delusion. Svâmi Abhedānanda has revealed here the central idea of *Pancadasi* philosophy faithfully and has sought to awaken an interest of the reader in it. The method of treatment is essentially logical rather than historical. The historical background furnished for the convenience of the readers repays study.

S. S.

The Concept of Space in Indian Philosophy. By Swami Madhavtirtha. Published by the Vedant Ashram, Post Valad, Station-Medra. (Ahmedabad-Prantij Rly). Price Rs. 1-8-0.

As claimed by the author, rather modestly in his preface, this small book of 116 pages gives "positive philosophical and scientific knowledge of space, or at least" makes " clear to the philosophical world the magnitude of the problem and provides" the thinkers with such materials by which further research on the subject could be made. But the Svāmi's theme is set much higher and wider. He seeks to solve the task set for the philosophers by the Twenty-sixth Indian Philosophical Congress held at Poona on the 2nd of December 1951. He gives this as follows: "The world is facing a crisis in human thought and sentiments as it stands on the brink of a conflagration which politicians are unable to prevent and it is for philosophers to help preserve peace in the world by defining the ultimate goal and aim of human existence." He continues "The days of spinning-wheel philosophy are over, as farmers are compelled to use engines for growing more food and government is compelled to import and manufacture more machinery to meet the industrial needs of the people. The time has come for integral education, which will remove all spatial and temporal divisions. This cannot be done by a majority of votes, as, in all periods of human existence, the philosophers have remained in minority. Therefore, the rulers will have to keep philosophers as their advisers." This Indian tradition is humbler than Plato's dictum that only philosophers should be kings and does not call for a Janaka in every kingdom. " The main thesis is given

succintly in these words: "The latest researches of the science of relativity helps us to understand the nature of *Māya* or measure and Indian philosphy helps us to remove the *Māya*. Both are necessary for integral or spiritual progress." "Within the realm of division, we can never find the Real but only an aspect of it. The Real is prior to this division into related and opposed complementaries, which division is all that is meant by creation. Creation means more and more disintegration and spiritual state means complete integration. . . . . Space-time is the entity which ties the perspectives together. Event is made out of space-time which is finite though unbounded; therefore, *Mokṣa* (*i.e.* liberation from a state of system of reference) is possible and can be secured by sound philosophical observation."

Who has created the space between two persons and who has created the space between two objects? Unless we know how events are created, we cannot know how space is created? In Indian philosophy देशपरिच्छेदकत्वं is defined as follows:

"That which is opposite (प्रतियोगि) to absolute non-entity creates the division of space." But "The space does not say that I am the space and the two objects also do not say that they are here or there. There must be somebody to observe these objects and there must be some-one to know the space that is lying between two objects. But why does a man see divisions of space between one man and another man?'" The answer in the words of Yājñavalkya is "If any man sees anything separate from him, the spirit in that substance will consider that observer as separate from it. Here is a very definite statement as to how space is created *i.e.* it is due to erroneous vision (अज्ञान)." And "it is said in the Bhāgwat (II.24.20) that this world will last as long as the God in the individuals will see it in the above manner. The fundamental tenet of the Vedānt school consists not in denying matter but in correcting the popular notion of it and in contending that it has no essence independent of mental perception, that existence and perceptibility are convertible terms." In the science of relativity "Prof. Milne says that the radius of (space) between

two points is proportional to the velocity of the observer." To quote Yājñavalkya again यत्रहि द्वैत मिव भवति तदितर इतरं पश्यति etc. "This means spatial separation is created by the following two causes: (1) By considering oneself as living at one place through ignorance, and (2) By identification with the nature of the mind and the senses."

"According to Vedānt, the universal consciousness is particularised by two classes of determinants: (1) Qualifying adjuncts (विशेषण) and (2) Limiting adjuncts (उपाधि). The Vedānt philosophy leads us not to a negation of existence but to a transcendence of conception. Human space is true within human limits but human limits are not true." In science, also "we have now to consider laws of a system rather than laws of absolute space or time which does not exist...Modern science says that perceptual space is within the perceptual event and as the perceptual event changes according to the system of reference, space is an illusion."

The author develops this text by reliance on the Bâgavat and the Mândūkya Upaniṣad and its emphasis on the totality of experience comprising the states of waking, dream and sound sleep. "The transition from the ego to the egoless state...is not through a change or evolution from the lower to the higher nature in man but through the total denial or destruction of the egoistic state." And no relation or relativity exists without आत्ममाया or ego-measure, to wit, Ego as "the system of reference" to use the language of the science of Relativity. In the author's words "we screen truth by our hopes and fears, by our desires and disappointments...What a man sees around him is not the world but rather the interpretation he makes of the world which he makes with his senses...Therefore, it is our attitude to the world that requires to be modified, not the external world...One of the conditions for a right understanding of the world is the destruction of the sense of separateness in oneself ...The element of unreality is not in life but in our interpretation of it...The true waking is the egoless state...Unhappiness is no other than the separation from the universal and happiness is just the return to the source."

The treatment of the subject is refreshing and the thesis is of enthralling interest. This book leads us on to the author's book on "Integral Education."

A. V. R.

Integral Education. (ब्रह्मविद्या) By Swami Madhavtirth. Published by The Vedant Ashram. Post Valad. (Ahmedabad. Prantij Rly.) Price Rs. 1-8-0.

"INTEGRAL EDUCATION" in the author's words, "is the king of all other educations. It indicates both what has to be learnt and what has to be unlearnt. It gives a type of experience in which there is an integral undivided consciousness, in which feelings are fused, ideas melt into one another, boundaries broken and ordinary distinctions transcended. . . . . Integration means wholeness, *i.e.* a state, complete in itself. . . . . It is stated in the Upaniṣads that "एकेन विज्ञानेन सर्वं विज्ञातं भवति" *i.e.*" by knowing one, all else is known. . . . This one is the Supreme Self . . . In knowing it, the lower self (individual) and his attachments make constant demands and create great disintegration. Desire in any form is a foe to the real *ātman*. . . . . The soul must be liberated from the passions of joy, hope, fear and grief. Masses will advance slowly. In the meanwhile, those who can advance must advance. They should not be brought back to the level of the crowd. The masses are in need of good leaders; therefore, those who can advance in the cultural sense, must advance without delay. From the practical point of view, there is at present a great necessity to bring control over consumption of wealth. Therefore, those who can regulate desires and who can give integral education should be encouraged by the state governments. It is very difficult for a politician to develop an integral way of life. It is also difficult for a social servant who belongs to a group . . . . Social service under modern conditions has only accentuated the 'saviour' complex in the servants of society—a complex which is the enemy of integral spiritual life . . . Creation means more and more disintegrative observation; spiritual observation means integrated knowledge . .

The work of an integrated man is unique. He expresses his total being in his life. He cares little for the rewards of money, fame or material happiness. He unfolds a new type of consciousness which requires to be incorporated in our educational system. It is not a question of majority of votes. We want a few persons able enough to show by their lives that men can be more happy by few wants and by integral thinking. . . . God meant every part of our life to be capable of expression as worship. Modern civilisation is making this impossible. Economic and social questions demand so much attention that cultural and spiritual questions are not fully attended to. Yet life is short and each should begin the reform with himself. A man can be king of his mind and body, if he lives a cultured life. Each man moves in the limited or expansive circle of his own thoughts and all outside that circle is unknown to him. A disturbed mind gives a distorted reflection of the world. If his mind is wholesome, integral and rightly tuned, he will not whim and whimper over his circumstances but will rise up and outgrow them. Circumstances are a severe task-master to the weak and an obedient servant to the strong. No man is helplessly bound. To know this he has but to act upon it. A wise man does not complain if he is poor. When our social reformers will condemn vice as they now condemn the rich, when they are as eager to abolish wrong living as they now are to abolish low wages, we may look for a diminution in that form of degraded poverty which is one of the dark spots in our civilisation. The new science of relativity has brought the system of reference round one observer, in other words the only events which an observer actually experiences are events at himself. Therefore, self-education must precede the education of society. Integration can be secured "(i) by uniting the differences or (ii) by denying the differences." For the first method "it is necessary to integrate science, philosophy and religion. But several persons want to integrate sensual life with spiritual life. This cannot be done as sensual life requires the consciousness that I am the body and spiritual life requires the consciousness that I am not the body." "If high culture is to be developed, there must be some kind of control over

consumption of articles of luxury. This cannot be done unless there is control over senses and control over sensual enjoyment will not come unless there is right education by teachers who have themselves got full control over sensual enjoyments. . . . Sensory and material values are now accepted as the goal of human happiness, ambitions and desires. These values range from money, wealth, material comfort and material security, to popularity, fame, power and prestige. As these values are not unlimited, they produce a never ending intense, often bloody and anti-social struggle." "Man's greatest good lies in pleasure (*sic*) and avoidance of pain? We must have a sound theory of knowledge. By proper integration of knowledge, new concepts will begin to appear. A true enlargement of the mind is the power of viewing many things as one whole. Man is not merely body or mind but is spirit as well. Discipline, restraint, and right thinking will help us to put our consciousness into relations with the supreme. The enormous advance gained by the sciences of inanimate matter over those of living beings is one of the greatest catastrophes suffered by humanity. As natural conditions of existence have been destroyed by modern civilisation, the science of man has become the most necessary of all sciences. We are applying to man concepts belonging to the mechanical world. In man, the things that are unseen and not measurable are more important than those that are seen and are measurable. It is chiefly through intellectual and moral discipline and the rejection of the habits of the herd that men can reconstruct themselves. Integrative knowledge is different from the conceptual or perceptual knowledge. The former is non-sensuous, immediate knowledge which knows no divisions. But it is not easy to obtain wholeness in thinking. It must be remembered that the seed of integration or disintegration does not spring up in the state; but rather in its individuals." Similarly the science of Relativity, by denying the existence of absolute space and absolute time lays emphasis on unity by denying the differences of which time and space form the frame-work. "Evolution may be a part of the cosmic process; but the Absolute is not subject to it. Distances, lengths, volumes are all relative to particular frames of reference. That man can be free who knows

that in his essential nature, he is indeterminate, specially with regard to time and space. There is no cosmic time and so we cannot speak of the state of the universe at two different times. The data for our knowledge of the world are infected with subjectivity. Therefore, if we want to secure integration we must look to the observer rather than to the object of observation. The question as to what shall succeed our attainment of self-realisation cannot logically arise, for succession and happenings are possible within time and change and are meaningless when they are transcended. Within the realm of division (*Māyā*—measurement, limitation) we never find the Real but only an aspect of it. The Real is prior to this division into related and opposed complementaries, which division is all that is meant by creation. Creation never recedes in the past. It is ever present in the universe. The Vedânt helps us in denying differences. When the spiritual perception transcends time and space, it will reveal fundamental properties of the human soul as a whole."

The author in chapter five of the book takes us rapidly over the Bhāgavatam and indicates how Parīkṣit obtained integral education in seven days. *Māyā* according to him means limitation and it has two aspects of disintegration :—" (1) due to likes and dislikes ; and (2) due to time and space."

" The first can be conquered by good devotional life and by the grace of God ; the second can be removed by true knowledge *i.e.* right thinking. The first method helps us to unite differences, the second to deny differences. A disintegrated person leads a life full of fears and desires. An integral person sees one in all and all in one. He goes beyond politics and even beyond yoga, which believes in the theory of change."

The following question of Parīkṣit and answer of S'ukadēvji is of perennial interest and refreshing in its illumination and bears endless repetition :

" Parīkṣit :—If this kind of knowledge leads to integration why should there be so many religions in the world ?

S'ukdēvji :—The founders of all religions have given integral knowledge to their disciples: but after their death, the disciples fail to maintain the integrity given to them. They . . . fall a prey to the vicissitudes of divided life and forget the true mission of their masters."

The controversy about *Sarvamukti* raised at a session of the Indian Philosophical Congress and also forming a point of cleavage between Mahāyāna and Hinayāna Buddhists finds its answer in the following passages: "The knower in the waking life when he attains to inner light and right knowledge knows all the persons in the waking life to be liberated. He who on waking up to his real nature of eternal life finds others also to be unquestionably free, is the best knower of truth (आत्मविद्वर Sūta Saṁhita III. IV. 48-49). He who considers others as bound, binds himself. If any one wants to help others, in that condition, he does not know himself. His ego is formed by the vision of others and not by the vision of the One. Vedânt views the one as the perfect One. On that level the other is an illusion. There is no other."

The author appeals for this integral education and he pleads that the *Varṇa-āsrama dharma* was a necessity to preserve that education and to provide the teachers with integral vision. Those with integral vision had to be separated as Brahmins and their physical needs provided for by the community and every individual had to pass from celibate life of preparation to that of *grahastha* or worldly duties, then retire from active worldly life to the preparatory spiritual of *vānaprastha* and fulfil his life with knowledge as *sanyāsi*.

A. V. R.

SYMBOLISM OF THE YAJNOPAVITA

BY

S. SRIKANTAYA

Price Re. 1-8-0 or 3 Shillings or 75 Cents

Mr. Srikantaya's well-written and correctly-documented pamphlet is bound to be welcomed by students of Hindu ritualism and social anthropology.

—*The Indian Express.*

The monogram is illustrated by diagrams of Gods. It is an interesting thesis and well-written.

—*The Hindu.*

An Useful Book for Schools, Libraries and Students of Mysore History.

MODERN MYSORE

By Rajakarayaprasakta Rao Bahadur M. SHAMA RAO, M.A.

(*Retired Civilian of Mysore*)

A very interesting and useful book on Mysore History from the time of the Early Yadava Kings of Mysore to the trip to Europe of His Highness Sir Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar IV; in Two volumes.

Price: Rs. 10-0-0 India; £. 1-0-0 Foreign; $. 5 America

POSTAGE & PACKING EXTRA

Copies can be had from:

THE GENERAL SECRETARY,

Mythic Society, Daly Memorial Hall,

Cenotaph Road, BANGALORE-2.

The Mythic Society

(Founded in 1909)

(Registered Under Act III of 1904)

The Society promotes the study of Archæology, Anthropology, Art, Architecture, Ethnology, Folk-lore, History, Mythology, Philosophy, Religion and other allied subjects more particularly in Mysore and Southern India and stimulates research in the above subjects.

The activities of the Society are:

(*a*) To publish a Quarterly Journal containing original research articles on subjects connected with the objects of the Society and the transactions of the Society, (*b*) to arrange for lectures from eminent scholars, and (*c*) to maintain a library and a free reading room.

Privileges of membership:

(*a*) Free supply of the journal, (*b*) use of the library and reading room, (*c*) lectures, intimation of which will be given to members in Bangalore, (*d*) to bring their friends to lectures, (*e*) to purchase the publications of the Society at a discount of 6¼%, (*f*) to have the privilege of Rules 105 of the Rules of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and (*g*) to vote at the Annual Meeting.

Contributions are accepted from scholars on subjects connected with our objects. They must be type-written or legibly written on one side of the paper only. Contributors are entitled to two dozen reprints of their contributions free of cost.

Books on Indology are reviewed in the Quarterly. All books intended for review may be sent to the Editor.

Advertisement charges, etc. may be obtained on application.

Membership Subscription:

Rs. 5—0—0, or 10 shillings, or $ 2.50 per year.

Rs. 100—0—0, or £. 10—0—0, or $ 50 Life-membership.

Special Numbers of the Journal

The Silver Jubilee Volume	**Rs. 6-12-0**	Packing and
Sri Krishnaraja Memorial Number	**Rs. 4-8-0**	Postage Extra

Further details can be had from:

The General Secretary and Treasurer
THE MYTHIC SOCIETY
(Daly Memorial Hall)
Cenotaph Road, BANGALORE-2
(INDIA.)

PUBLICATIONS & REPRINTS
FOR SALE

No.	Title	Rs.	As.	*Sh.*	*d.*	$.cts.
1.	Essay on Guṇādhya and the Bṛhatkatha, by A. M. Tabard Pp. 1—42 ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
2.	Do do Pp. 1—92 ...	4	0	8	0	2.00
3.	Kannada Passages in the Oxyrhyncus Papyri, No. 413, by S. Srikantaya ...	1	0	2	0	0.50
4.	Indian Music, by D. B. Ramachandra Mudaliar	0	8	0	8	0.25
5.	Asvattaman (by Sri) : A Critical Study by S. Srikantaya	0	12	1	4	0.60
6.	The Birthplace of Buddha, By A. M. Tabard ...	1	0	2	0	0.50
7.	The Exploits of King Kampila and Kumara Ramanatha, by M. H. Rama Sharma ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
8.	The Solar Signs in Indian Literature, by B. V. Kameswara Ayyar ...	0	4	0	6	0.12
9.	Kailasa Pilgrimage of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, by S. Srikantaya ...	1	4	2	4	0.65
10.	Heavenly Mansions of the Hindus, by S. Srikantaya	2	8	5	0	1.25
11.	Founders of Vijayanagara, by S. Srikantaya ...	5	0	10	0	2.50
12.	Modern Mysore, by M. Shama Rao, Two Vols.	10	0	20	0	5.0
13.	Report of the Gilgit Excavation in 1938, by M. S. Kaul Sastri	1	8	3	0	0.75
14.	Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Mythic Society, XX and onwards each ...	0	4	0	4	0.12
15.	Balacarita, by Prof. K. R. Pisharoti, M.A. ...	0	6	0	6	0.15
16.	Sri Krishnaraja Wadiyar IV. by S. Srikantaya	1	0	2	0	0.50
17.	Talk with the Planchette ...	2	0	4	0	1.00
18.	Symbolism of the Yajnopavita ...	1	8	3	0	0.75
19.	Index to QJMS for each Volume (if available) ...	0	6	0	6	0.12
20.	Back Numbers of the QJMS Vols. I to V, VII & X onwards ... per Volume	8	0	16	0	4.00
21.	Do do per Issue (If available)	2	8	4	8	1.50

(Packing, Postage, etc. Extra)

Can be had from :—

The General Secretary & Treasurer
Mythic Society, Daly Memorial Hall
Cenotaph Road, Bangalore-2.
(INDIA)

London Agents :

Messrs. ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN,
41, Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1.

Modi Power Printing Works, Bangalore City.